UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/539,445	06/20/2005	Yoshinori Komatsu	Q88710	6821	
65565 SUGHRUE-265	7590 10/16/2008 5550		EXAMINER		
	LVANIA AVE. NW		O HERN, BRENT T		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20037-3213		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1794		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/16/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/539,44	.5	KOMATSU ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Brent T. C		1794				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the	cover sheet with the d	correspondence ad	ldress			
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR FOR HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 (SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate) operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF TH CFR 1.136(a). In no evo- tion. period will apply and wi y statute, cause the app	IIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be tir II expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	. 13 August 2008						
		This action is n						
3)	Since this application is in condition for a	_		osecution as to the	e merits is			
٠,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the applica	ation.						
/	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election re	equirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
· · ·	The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer						
-	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		Objected to by the	Examiner.				
. • / 🗀	Applicant may not request that any objection							
			-		FR 1.121(d).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
۵,		iments have bee	n received					
	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Stage			
	application from the International E	•			9-			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	t(s)							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.								
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	atent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) U Other:								

Application/Control Number: 10/539,445 Page 2

Art Unit: 1794

DETAILED ACTION

Claims

1. Claims 1-8 are pending with claim 8 new.

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

2. All rejections of record in the Office Action mailed 15 May 2008, page 2, paragraph 1 have been withdrawn due to Applicant's arguments in the Paper filed 13 August 2008.

NEW REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the **written description** requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The phrase "discharger" in claim 1, line 4 and claim 4, line 3 is **new matter** as the original disclosure does not disclose such.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castenmiller (US 4,874,626) in view of Clapp et al. (US 5,156,876) and Sejap et al. (US 3,849,580).

Castenmiller ('626) teaches a foamable composition such as a spread comprising a water-in-oil type emulsion or butter comprising an emulsifier that is a glycerin fatty acid ester or an enzyme-processed lecithin used for preparing the water-in-oil type emulsion wherein the water-in-oil type emulsion comprises an edible oil, an emulsifier and a gas propellant usable as a spread (See col. 3, II. 27-52, col. 5, II. 5-43, col. 6, I. 56 to col. 7, I. 15. The product is interpreted as being a foamable composition such as a spread, not a package, not a container and not a method of how it is made or used or how it is placed into or taken out of the container or how it may be foamed or jetted. The soybean plant is known to use biological enzymes in the synthesis of lecithin.), however, fails to expressly disclose a propellant dissolved in the emulsion.

However, Clapp ('876) teaches dissolving propellants into foamable spreadable fat/oil type compositions containing water in some formulations in aerosol containers having a discharging nozzles wherein foam can be generated at the time of jetting (See Abstract, col. 5, II. 14-31 and col. 5, I. 61 to col. 7, I. 24.) for the purpose of providing a stable food material that can be added to other foods without introducing undesirable flavors and colors (See col. 3, II. 20-33.).

Sejap ('580) teaches dissolving propellants into foamable spreadable butter, margarine -type compositions that are placed in aerosol containers having a discharging

Application/Control Number: 10/539,445 Page 4

Art Unit: 1794

nozzles wherein foam can be generated at the time of jetting (See col. 1, I. 23 to col. 2, I. 18 and col. 3, II. 12-35.) for the purpose of providing a stable, spreadable food material that does not need to be refrigerated (See col. 1, II. 13-51.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to dissolve a propellant into Castenmiller's ('626) composition and place it in an aerosol dispenser as taught by Clap ('876) and Sejap ('580) in order to provide a stable food that in some instances does not need to be refrigerated.

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

- 5. In response to Applicant's arguments (p. 5, para. 5 to p. 7, para. 2 of Applicant's Paper filed 13 August 2008) that mixtures of water-in-oil emulsions, per the amended claims, that are discharged from containers is not known, it is noted that spreads such as water-in oil emulsions are known as discussed above by Castenmiller ('626) and Clapp ('876). Dispensers for such foods are known as discussed above by Clapp ('876) and Sejap ('580).
- 6. In response to Applicant's arguments (p. 6, para. 3 to p. 7, para. 2 of Applicant's Paper filed 13 August 2008) regarding the crystallization step, it is noted that said arguments are not clear. A crystallizer is a known piece of equipment in the manufacture of shortening/margarine/spreads etc. where the fat/hydrogenated oil is fed as a liquid at an elevated temperature and processed with the aid of gas into a soft creamy solid product with the desired density and crystallinity. But for this step the product such as a spread would either have the consistency of a bar of soap or a

combination of liquid oil and hard fat. This process step clearly improves the performance of the spread and is commonly used in the industry.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent T. O'Hern whose telephone number is (571)272-0496. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Tarazano can be reached on (571) 272-1515. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/539,445 Page 6

Art Unit: 1794

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BTO/ Brent T O'Hern Examiner, Art Unit 1794 October 12, 2008

/Elizabeth M. Cole/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794